



THE
MINISTERS
PORTION.

BY

WILLIAM SCLATER,

BACHELAR OF DIVINITY,

and Minister of the word of God at PLY-

MOUTH in Somerset.



AT OXFORD,

Printed by Joseph Barnes. 1612i



THE
MINISTERS
OF

BY

WILLIAM GILBERT

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY
and Minister of the Gospel in the
Church of England.



AT OXFORD

Printed by J. H. Johnson, 18, Abchurch Lane.



TO THE WORSHIPFULL M^r
THOMAS SOUTHCOT ESQUIRE,
at MOONBURY in Devon, grace
and peace.

SIR, when I first meditated what at
your instance I revised, and now al-
most enforced, publish: I expected co-
tradictions from Mammonistes, and
scarse hoped to perswade men savou-
ring of better things: Such a holdfast
is covetousnes, so incredulous is pre-
iudice. Farther opposition from bre-

thren, and Iudicious men, was as farre from my thought, as
I am in this point from their opinion. But Austin saith wel;
Deus donat prodesse nobis non solum quod docet ve-
ritas, verum etiā quod obstreperit vanitas. And such oppo-
sitions against truth are thus farre for it, that they occasion
more intentiue search, and clearer discovery of the truth.
My purpose is not to prescribe to any mans faith. Nam
quis ego sum? Even the least of Gods little ones. Yet as one
that hath obtained mercy of God to be faithfull, let me en-
treat this favour from men, to be heard on even termes,
with me, I freely confesse, of far greater gifts, yet, as I thinke,
having no such evidence in this point, to carry away so bad-

Aug. cont. Ad-
vers. Ieg. & pro-
phet. li. 1. c. 24.

smooth a conclusion of such dependance. This, I hope, will appeare to any impartiall reader, that the reasons here brought for tythes, are much nearer to demonstratiue, then those against them are to probable arguments. My poore paines I haue inscribed to your worship, as for many your well deserving of me, and the Church of God; so for that you first urged a review of the first rude draught, and haue given me so manie occasions to thinke you will not be the last in practising this vnprofitable profitable conclusion, when once your Iudgement shalbee convinced. And though I loue not to bee peremptory, (for I know mine owne blindnes) yet this I thinke I may say; the reasons on both sides being peized in even balance, there will scarce be left place for an ~~error~~ or suspense of Iudgment except men be resolute to hold their conclusion in despite of all contrary premises. Now the God of all truth direct our hearts to the knowledge and loue, and obedience of the truth. And the same God that begun his good worke in you, confirme; and perfect it to the day of our Lorde Iesus Christ. Amen.

Your worships in the truest loue,

WILLIAM SCLATER.

1. CoR. 9. 13, 14.

- 13 Do yee not know that they which minister about the holy things, live of the things of the Temple? and they which wait at the Altar, are partakers with the Altar?
- 14 Eue so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospell, should live of the Gospell.



His whole period of Scripture, from ver. 5. to 15. consists of one discrete axiome, in summe this: Though I Paule haue power and right to live at the charge of the Church, ver. 5. yet I haue not vsed that power, ver. 12. the reason whereof he giues; *Least hee should hinder the Gospell of Christ*, through suspicion of mercenary. Affection in preaching. Now for that it might be questioned whether he had any such right or no, hee avowes the truth of his title; by arguments *à genere*, he was an Apostle & preacher of the Gospell, ver. 1. *Ergo* had right. 2. preventingly; *à pari*, in the practise of others; ver. 5. 6. *as well as Peter &c.* And for that the claime might not seeme equall betwixt Paule and Cephas and the Lords brethren, he sheweth that to every minister of the Gospell, maintenance is due for their worke sake. By reasons, 1. From voice of nature and consent of nations in other semblant imployments, *as who goes to war, &c.* ver. 7. 2. From mandare of the law of God. *Saith not the law of God the same, &c.* ver. 8. 9. 10. 3. From excellency of blessings conferred by Ministers, compared with qualitie of things exacted for recompence; *If we sowe spirituall things &c.*

ver. 11. 4. From allowed practise of Leviticall ministry, ver. 13. Lastly, from expresse ordinance of Christ, *the Lord hath ordained*, &c. ver. 14. this the frame of the text.

Out of all which amounts this plaine Apostolicall conclusion; That *maintenance is due from people to Ministers for their worke sake*. Other proofes then are here set downe, it is needlesse to vse. Vvee haue here more then two or three witnesses, fiue sound reasons inforcing it. The bare word of an apostle is enough to carry a point more doubtfull. How much more should it sway with vs, when Gods spirit that spake in them, is pleased by so many reasons to avouch it? Is it not then a sound tenet (trow we) of some, that Ministers maintenance is meer almes? and that in iustice, and as due, they can challenge nothing for their labour in the word and doctrine?

1 Where then is *Pauls i^uria*, his right, lawful power and authoritie, to receaue maintenance from the people, v. 4? 2 How saith our Saviour, they are *worthie of their hire*, ^a*Pauls worthy of double honour*^b? 3 What great thing was this that *Paule* did in taking no maintenance, ver. 12. 15? By these mens diuinitie he had right to none.

2 And what ods is there betwixt this beggerly conclusion of those old beggers, and that of late separatists, that make it Christs ordinance for Ministers to liue of their peoples voluntary contribution; and hold it as Christs owne Canon, that no set maintenance shoulde be allotted vs, no not by humane ordinance, but the people left at liberty to giue or not to giue, to giue much or little, otherwise then selfe devotion shall incline them? May I not say of this and the former as *Joseph of Pharaos dreames*, ^c*the dreames are one*? Words onely

^a Luk 9. 7.

^b 1. Tim 5. 17.

^c Gen 41. 25.

onely haue made a variation. Ministers must liue of the peoples voluntary contribution: me thinkes I heare S^c Pauls tenour for almes, ^d *As every man wisbeth in his heart so let him giue.* Their reasons had need be pregnāt: let ys view them. 1. Forsooth the Apostles thus liued. *Resp.* J yeeld it of some of them: yea sometimes made their own hands minister to their necessities: why force they vs not to mechanicaall trades? For so liued some Apostles. But 1 they had power to exact maintenance, sith they had right^e to haue it. 2. Occasionall practise ^e 1. Cor. 9. 4, 5 binds not to imitation, but in occurrence of like occasions. When scandall inforceth to forbear exaction, we will herein follow their holy example, least by any meanes we hinder the Gospell; ver. 12. and farther then this, their example vrgeth not.

Their second reason is this: because it must be scene that what the people giue this way, they giue of loue, not for feare of the law. *Resp.* and it must bee scene that the people^f come willingly at the daies of assembling. Therefore Magistrats may not compell by autoritie to serue the Lord as good Iosiah did, for now they beare the ^f Ps. 110. 3. sword in vaine. But thus J reason and so leaue them. ^g 2. Chr. 34. 31 ^{32. 33.}

To every duty Magistrats may bind by lawe, & compell by punishment. Yeelding maintenance to Ministers is a dutie. Therefore thereto may Magistrates binde by lawes. *Miserum est* (saith the Poet) *alienā vivere quadrā:* if for any, miserable; sure most for a minister. This if any thing, breeds right trencher Chaplens, & would soon fill the Church with sweet tongued & mealemouthed preachers.

3 I may not leaue vtterly vntouched our peoples, whe-

whether ignorant or affectionate error: that thinke of their payments to Ministers, as of almes to their beaſt-men; for ſooth we liue by them. I ſay no more but this,

1. Cor. 9. 11.

1. If we by them in carnall things, they by vs in ſpiritu-

al. Is the barter ſo hard as ſhould occaſion exprobratiō?

1. Cor. 9. 14.

2. *Not by you but by the Lords ordinance* ſaith the Apoſtle.

And that Lord, that hath given to the people the nines; hath allotted to vs (*audaſter dicam*) the tenthes as ours.

4 I would faine leaue this reproofe, but that I ſee the error hath wound it ſelfe into the minds of many of holy profeſſion and praſtiſe, who yet delight to haue Miniſters acknowledge a debt, even for receit of dues; and deſire to haue conſcience free from all bonds more then of humane lawes, in this matter of recompencing our labours. If ought come elſe more then law or cuſtome, if but a cup of cold water, they ſupererogate ſurely in reſpect of the Miniſter. They much forget who ſaid, *thou oweſt vnto me even thy owne ſelfe.*

Philem 5. 19

And of the generall thus farre. Now the inquiry I take it, is not impertinent here; ſith maintenance is due to Miniſters for their worke ſake, what portion or quantitie that is, that by Gods ordinance belongs to them. And me thinkes in a dutie ſo generally, though plainly taught, the conſcience of the hearers ſhould deſire a more particular direction. Yee will therefore (I hope) giue leaue ſomething more particularly to examin the matter. And herein I hold it not amiſſe, firſt to propoūd what is yeelded on all ſides, where is any ſoundneſſe of iudgement. 2. Then to adde ſome other principles, as plainly

plainely taught in the Scriptures of the new Testamēt.
Lastly to enquire and resolve of the particular.

The grants on all sides are these. 1. That there is a maintenance^h in iustice due to Ministers and their families for their worke sake. 1. Cor. 9. 4, 5
ad 15.

2 It is yeilded that it must be competent; not only for supply of naturall necessities, but for their furniture to every good work of their calling.

3 That it must be^m liberall; not such as every nig- m 1. T. 3. 5. 17
18.gardly minde will iudge convenient and competent.

To which grants, let me adde these postulata, as plainely determined in the Scriptures.

1 That to the Ministers of the Gospell belongs a maintenance as large, as to the Leviticall Priesthood; this me thinks, excellencie of ministry, ⁿ and blessings n 1. Cor. 3.
1. Cor. 9.
n Gal. 6. 6.conferred thereby, enforceth.

2 That this maintenance must rise out of ⁿ all and every the goods of al and every of the people instructed.

3 Shall I adde another to me seeming more the probable; that is, that the Lord hath as certainly provided for our maintenance vnder the Gospell, as for theirs vnder the law. For had the Lord lesse care of vs? was there lesse need in respect of the peoples backwardnesse? no. But he entrusted magistrats with that care. *Resp.* And were there not Magistrats among the Iewes?

4 That the Lord in the Leviticall law made provision for vs that were to minister in the Gospell. Its cleere by the Apostles twise alleaging that ordinance of ^o o 1. Cor. 9. 9.
1. Tim. 5. 18.not *muzzling the mouth of the ox.*

Thus farre I thinke we walke safely, sith in the very steps of the holy Ghost leading vs in the newe Testament.

ment. Let vs now descend toward the particular.

Some tumbling downe headlong rather then descending, resolve of a competency indeterminate; so the allowance be competent, all is well. *Resp.* Then in case of this fancied competency, some of the instructed though wealthy perhaps, shall be exempted from the Apostles iniunction: for suppose some one or two of the well disposed hearers, shall out of their privat, make a competent allowance, the rest shall now reap our spirituall things, and not sow their carnall. For as the saying is rife, enough in a ministers maintenance, *Enough is a feast*: but saith the Apostle, *Let him is*. every him that is instructed, *make his instructor partaker of all his goodes*. 2. See conclusion sixt; & duly weighing it, tell me whether thou find conscience satisfied with this imaginary competency? For is there no certaine provision for Ministers of the Gospell, but this vncertaine competency? who shall iudge of it? Every man? *malem Cerberum metueres*, as the Orator speaks. The Magistrat? why would not the Lord leaue this to Iewish Magistrats? no not to *Moses*, a man so gracious with him? and leaue it to magistrats vnder the Gospell? 3. How hath he committed this to Magistrats? absolutely or with limitation? if with limits, what are these bounds? forsooth a competency. Perceauē you not circling and meere vncertainties?

Leaue we this fancy, and see whether wee may find some other more certaine particular, to resolve of. And surely when wee haue in vaine turmoiled our selues to avoid Iudaizing in this point of ministers maintenance, we shall be forced at length to acknowledge Tenthes, which

which some call Jewish, to be the Ministers appointed portion.

That the truth may the better appeare, I will propound the different opinions that I haue met withal in this point.

1 Brownists in this question thus peremptorily resolve. That Tithes are so meereley ceremonious and Leviticall, that they cannot without betraying Evangelicall liberty and disavowing Christs Priesthood, be retained as maintenance of Ministers of the Gospell. And how full soever of dotage this dreame may seeme: yet this I will say for them; They are madd with more reason a great deale, then any others which hold them ceremonies Levitical. If the assumption were true, their conclusion woulde soundly followe by doctrine of the Apostle. *Gal. 4. & 5. Col. 2. &c.*

2 Some others thinking them iudicial, resolve; part, that they may be lawfully retained as the Ministers stipend; part, that they are the most convenient maintenance can be allotted vs.

3 A third sort, that they are due by Gods law, to Ministers of the Gospell; but these in explanation of them, selues diversly deriue them thence.

1. some thus: due by Gods law enioyning obedience to the magistrate in things lawfull and convenient. These giue them no other ground in Gods word, then other humane ordinances.

2 Others, due by Gods law: in as much as the church (whose authoritie with them is diuine) hath enioined their payment. So generally Papists.

3 A third sort thus: due by Gods lawe; in respect of
B 2 their

their consecration to God, either by receaved custome and consent of Churches, or by donation of princes, or legacie of testatours. In which opinion I must needs professe my selfe to haue beene long; and never to my knowledge of other; til of late being to deliver my iudgment to my people, J more purposely set my selfe to see what the truth was. And during that mistake, I thus thought; that they could not without sacrilege be alienated from their general end. my reasons were these,

¶ Pro. 20. 25. 1 That J had found *Salomon* averring it to bee a curse to devour holy things, and had seene the curse exemplified on many. 2. That ordinance of the Lord J held morall & perpetuall, [¶] Nothing separate from common use, no not of those which man had separated, might be againe unhallowed, no nor redeemed. 3. That saying of the Apostle

¶ Levit. 27. 18, 29.

¶ Gal. 3. 15.

much swaied with me, [¶] If it bee but a mans testament no man abrogats it. i. no man ought to abrogate it. And so much the more, for that being once an auditour of thae iudicious divine M^r Perkins, whose memory is blessed; J heard him moue the doubt, whether things given to superstitious vses; suppose to maintaine malmonging, might be alienated. and thus asloile to my remembrance. That from the particular intention, wherein through ignorance they erred, alienation might be; but frō the generall ende, maintenance of Godes worship, they might not be aliened. Thus then & vpon these grounds my conclusion is still the same, though my media bee other, and something more peremptory. Now because it is a labour long and needlesse to discusse every of the former differences (for the saying is true, *verum est index sui & obliqui*;) J will first propound the conclusion with

with the explanation; 2. Proceed to confirmation; And lastly annex solution of Arguments, such as I haue met withall, having any; shew of ground from the word of God, to overthrowe the conclusion.

The Conclusion in few words is this. *Tithes are the portion, at least part of that portion, by Gods word allotted to Ministers for their service in the gospel.*

By Tithes vnderstande the tenth part of all the hearers increase: particulars may be read, *Leuit. 27. 30. & Pro. 3. 9. alibi.* In a word to vse the distinction of Canonists, whether they be personall, of industry, negotiation; &c. or prediall, as of grounds, &c. or mixt, as of cattell: the tenthes of the whole encrease, not those of Cumin & Anise excepted^u, fall within compasse of our subiect. ^u *Mat. 23. 23.*

1 Of Tithes amongst Iews we may finde fowre sorts distinguished by their ends, 1. some, which for distinction sake, we may call stipendary, assigned to Levits for recompence of their service. *Numb. 18. 24.*

2 A second sort which wee may call sacrificatory: Tithes for sacrifice, Some call them *Decimas secundaneas*, some *Decimas decimarum*: a tithe of the Levits Tithes to be given to Aaron, as an heaue offering vnto the Lord. *Numb. 18. 28.*

3 A third kinde you may stile *Convivales*, banquetting or feasting tithes, appointed for solemne feastes at their generall assemblies to Ierusalem, *Deut. 14. 22, 23.*

4 The last sort may be tearmed *Eleemosynaria*. Some call them *decimas pauperum*, a tithe which for reliefe of the poore, widdowes, strangers, &c. were every thirde yeare to be set out of their goods, ever and aboue the other annuall tithes, *Deut. 24. 29.*

This distinction of tithes I thought good to mention out of the Leviticall law: though this I professe, not to claime our tithes by the mandate given in lawe Leviticall.

Now our question is, only of those tithes which we called stipendary; the rest being two sortes of them apparently ceremonious; the third as plainly a iudicial ordinance. And of those tithes stipendary, this is that we affirme, that by the word of God they belong for ever to Ministers of holy things, and therefore in these daies to Ministers of the gospel, who alone haue now to do with publike ministrations of the worship of God.

Our reasons are these: first grounded on *Heb. 7. 6. 8.* *He whose descent is not counted from them, receaved tithes of Abraham; and ver. 8. here men that doe receiue tithes, but there he receaveth them of whom it is witnessed that be lieveth. Compare Gen. 14. 20.*

The argument which this scripture affordeth, hath received much disadvantage, by slender collection of many, thus only pressing it; Tithes were paid to Priests before the Levitical law was given: therefore their payment is founded rather on morall then ceremoniall law. To which, answer is well given, that by as good inference, sacrificing of beasts may be proved a morality, sith it also was in vse before giving of the law by *Moses*. That we may the better see the force of the Argument here given, let vs a little consider the frame and summe of the text.

The Apostle by occasion of the peoples dulnes, having digressed from *cap. 5. 11.* to *cap. 6. 20.* returnes now to his purpose; namely to shew the excellencie of
Christis

Christs priesthood about that of *Aaron*, by avouching him a Priest after th' order of *Melchisedec*. The conclusion is this: Christs priesthood is more excellent thē that of *Levi*; or Christ is a greater Priest then any after *Aarons* order. The reason principall lyeth thus; He that is a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec* is a greater Priest then the Priests after *Aaron*. But Christ is a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec*, *Ergo*, &c. The minor hath first his prooffe, 1. from a testimony of *David*, *psal. 110. 2.* frō that absolute agreement betwixt *Melchisedec*, & Christ: the partes whereof are these; 1. as *Melchisedec* was king and Priest of the most high God, so Christ; 2. as *Melchisedec* king of righteousness and prince of peace, so Christ. 3. as *Melchisedec* his parents, kindred, beginning, and end of life are not recorded: so Christ, as man, without father; as God, without mother, kindred, beginning, or end of life. Therefore Christ is truly a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec*. *ver. 1. 2. 3.*

The maior remaines to be proved and that hath his prooffe from *ver. 4.* to *11.* the summe whereof is comprised in this principall syllogisme. If *Melchisedec* be greater then *Levi*, then he that is a Priest after his order as Christ is; is greater thē *Levi*. But *Melchisedec* is greater then *Levi*. *Ergo*, &c. minor proved, greater then *Abraham* greater then *Levi*. *Melchisedec* is greater then *Abraham*. *Ergo* then *Levi*. minor proved: he to whom *Abraham* paid tithes, of whom he was blessed, is greater then *Abraham*. But to *Melchisedec* *Abraham* paid tithes, & *Melchisedec* blessed *Abraham*. *Ergo* is greater then hee, *ver. 4. 5. 6. 7.*

A second argument proving the greatnesse of this Priest

Priest about those of *Aarons* order, is laid down, *ver. 8.* A tithe taker. i. Priest, of whom its testified that he liues, is greater thē a tithe taker that dyeth. But the Priest after *Melchisedec* is a tithe taker of whom its testified that he liveth; Levits take tithes and die. *Ergo* the Priest after *Melchisedec* his order is greater then the Priests Levitical. This is in my simple Logique the disposition of the text. As for illustrations or amplifications by syllogismes, prolepses, or otherwise, I purposely omit them. Now me thinks, the text thus naturally resolved, there needs no farther deduction of the Argument, yet that the simplest may see what footing tithes haue here thus I collect it.

The portion due to Christs priesthood, is due to Ministers of the gospel: but tithes are the portion due to Christs priesthood. *Ergo*. The minor is thus proved.

The portion due to *Melchisedec* his priesthood, is due to Christs priesthood; reason, 1. for that Christs Priesthood and *Melchisedecs* are the same; or Christ is a Priest after that order: 2. other things enunciated of *Melchisedec*, are true of Christ eminently and alwaies: as its eminently and alwaies true of Christ, that he is king of righteousness and prince of peace; eminently and alwaies true of Christ, he is without parēts, without beginning and end of life, that he blesteth *Abraham* and al his seed, &c. All these are more properly verified of Christ then of *Melchisedec* his type. Why not then also this ever true of him; he taketh tithes?

Now I assume. But tithes are the portiō due to *Melchisedec* his priesthood, yea ever due to that Priesthood. For 1. they were paid by *Abrahā* to *Melchisedec*, 2. in the Apo-

Apostles Logicke; a Priest and receiver of tithes are equipollents. In stead of saying men that die are Priests; he saith, *men that doe receiue tithes*: in stead of saying *hee that liues is a Priest*; he saith, *he that liues takes tithes*: as if in his iudgement tithes and priesthood were as inseparable as kingdome and tribute.

Now the maior of the principall syllogisme if any doubt of, to wit, whether the portion due to Christ be due to Ministers, let him compare 1. Cor. 9. 14. where is the expresse ordinance of Christ, that Ministers should liue of the Gospell; 2. who in likelihood should bee his receauers, but these that are in his stead, as its said of Ministers, 2. Cor. 5. 20? 3. Besides the same reason which the Lord assignes of *Leui* his sharing in things to himselfe reserved and sanctified, is true of Ministers, or else of none. ^x *God is Leuits portion* i. Gods portion is *Le-^x Deut. 10. 8. 9*uits portion, because they were taken to Minister before him. Why not then also Christs portion Ministers portion, because they only are assumed to Christ to minister in the Gospell? A reason for not tithing of so plain deduction out of Scripture, if any can bring mee, hee shall much sway me to his sentence.

This argument I remember once to haue propounded something otherwise, to this purpose. The portion due to Priesthood after *Melchisedec* his order, is due to Ministers of the Gospell. But tithes are that portion. Ergo. and thus propounding it, I receaue these answers: the proposition seemes vntrue, except you can proue your selues Priests after that order. *Resp.* Wherto I thus answered; that though we be no Priests after that order yet is there truth in the proposition, sith Christ the high

C Priest

Priest of our profession to whome originally they belong, hath ordained vs to liue of his portion.

A second answer was by limitation; the portion due (by law) to that Priesthood is due to Ministers. But with that limitation the assumption is false, *Abrahams* payment being an act rather voluntary, then by any iniunction from God. But *contra*, that that act of *Abraham* was no act in this sense voluntary, but rather an act of necessary and inioined duty, is evident (me thinkes) by these reasons. 1. For that gifts voluntary proceeding from bountie or liberalitie, imply a superioritie or excellency in the giuer aboue the receauer. For *itis a more blessed thing*, in that kind, *to giue then to receaue*. But *Abrahams* payment of tithes was testimony of his inferiority. Againe the phrase it selfe ² implies as much: *Melchisedec tithed Abraham*, ver. 6. a phrase that looseth all his emphasis if no iniunction had subiected *Abraham* to a necessitie of being tithed. 3. What mean they whē they say of *Abrahams* tithing, that it was done without law? would they be vnderstood of *Abrahams* fact onely, or of tithing at large as it was in vse before the lawe written? Now sure I wonder how first ² *Abraham*, and then after him ^b *Jacob*, should fall vpon a tenth rather then a sixt or twelfth part, if there were nothing prescribed in their times for tithing? 2. How proue they but probably that it was without iniunction of law? If this be the reason for that we finde no mention of any law to that end given: by as good reason may they say of sacrifices, and sundry other actions religious, that they were arbitrary: sith we finde no expresse mandare given of them in those times. But thus mee thinkes wee may
better

⁷ A. 20. 35.

² Heb. 7. 4. 6.

² Gen. 14. 30.

^b Gen. 28. 22

better reason from their practise to an iniunction; these facts of theirs were approved of God, therefore not done without iniunction from him. And of this argument and clearing thereof thus farre.

The second argument hath his ground, Galat. 6.6. 1.Tim. 5.17. Prov. 3.9. where we read thus; *Let him that is instructed, make his instructor partaker of all his goods; & elders that rule well are worthie of double honour, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine. And honour God with thy substance, and with the chiefe of all thine increase.* Out of which Scriptures, thus we reason. If there bee a portion to be set out vnto God and his Ministers, out of all and every the temporall goods of every one instructed, and no certaine portion to bee found in scriptures but tithes: then are tithes the portion allotted by Gods word to Ministers for their service. But there is a portion to be set out vnto God and his Ministers out of the temporall goods of every one instructed, and no other certaintie mentioned in scripture but tithes. Ergo tithes are the portion allotted by Gods word to Ministers for their service.

The consequence of the proposition depends vpon this ground, that some certaintie is by scripture allotted vnto Ministers for their service. Hereof if any demand prooffe, let him consider these. First, for that the Lord allotted a certaintie vnto first borne and Levites: & thinke we it probable hee would leaue Ministers of the Gospell at randome to a competencie indeterminate? 2. In other cases this argument goes current. The Lord prescribes for the old Tabernacle all things necessarie even to the Besome and Ashpan; not a pin in the Ta-

bernacle, but what hath his prescript from god. Now surely of this we may say its not a pin, but even a *Clavus Trabalis*, one of the master nails in our Tabernacle. And thinke we his word so sufficient and absolutely exact for all necessary prescripts, yea circumstances concerning worship, government, any thing: and this only, a matter of so great consequence, left vnprescribed?

Lastly, if no certaintie in this kind can bee found in Scripture, how wilt thou be able to share out vnto god his portion in faith? so that thou maist bee able to say, I haue giuen the Lord that portion of my goods which he requireth of me? Forsooth the Magistrats determination shall in this point bee the leuill and rule of faith. *Resp.* 1. Then must thou bee able to shewe that the Lord hath made Magistrats in this point his Carvers, which is vnlikely *ut supra*: 2. Suppose Magistrats make no provision, where is then the direction for thy faith? 3. Suppose they shall assigne *Micah* his allowance: wilt thou therewith be content? Then sure al our lay persons, our *Micahs*, haue faith well guided, consciences rectified; *Iudg.* 17. 10. *ten shekels of silver, and a meales meat, and livery, they afford Sir Iobn.* In faith thinke wee? surely according to Magistrats provision. And why blame we any more, impropriat persons for so scāt allowance? perhaps because not competent. Yea but the Magistrate thinks it competent. And that is in this case the line of faith. *credam? non si mihi &c.*

Touching the minor, for the first part see *1. Cor.* 9. 11. *Prov.* 3. 9. *Gal.* 6. 6. in which place yee haue it in so many termes. *Let him that is instructed, make his instructor partaker of all his goods.* For the second branch of it; that no other

other portion certaine is to bee founde in scripture ; I meane which hath not an apparent signification of something peculiar to that state of the people vnder *Levi*, as first fruits, share of other sacrifices: will appeare to any man, that wilbe pleased to enter induction of particulars. And may I not then conclude Tithes are the portion allotted vs by the word of God? Yea what if I shoulde say even tithes are in some of these places more then obliquely pointed at? What meanes the Apostle to call for maintenance vnto Ministers vnder the terme of double honor?^d for that by honor he there ^{1. Tim. 5. 17.} meanes maintenance, the reason annexed will make a ^{18.} blinde man see. Surely *S. Hierome* having delivered his iudgement of that place, *Mal. 3. Bring all my tithes into the storehouse*, in these tearmes *Ecclesie populi preceptum est dare decimas*, alleageth presently this place for proof, *1. Tim. 5. 17. Elders must haue double honor*. Again what meanes the Apostle by that Epithete (double) honour? say some, double. i. large and liberall; but why double rather then treble, if he meant large, at large? Doth he not rather in that Epithet send vs to consider of than ^e ^{Numb. 3. 14.} double portion of the first barne in whose roome *Levi* was assumed? And that which made their portiō double, was in part tithes, as shall hereafter at least probably appeare vnto vs. Proceede we to a third reason which is grounded on *Levit. 27. 28. Prov. 20. 25. Rom. 2. 22. Mal. 3. 8.* where we read thus, *Everything separate from common use, is most holy vnto the Lord. And it is a snare to devour holy things, & after the vow to inquire. And thou which abhorrest idols, committest thou sacrilege? And yee haue robbed me.* Out of which places thus we reason. The portion which

which hath bin separated from common vse, to maintenance of Gods worship vnder the new testament, is the portion allotted by the word of God to Ministers for their service.

But tithes are the portion, at least part of the portion separate from common vse to maintenance of Gods worship vnder the new testamēt. *Ergo* &c. the maior is thus proved; because the detainement or alienating of things so consecrated, is sacrilege. That this may the better appeare, it wilbee worth the while to consider briefly what sacrilege is: which out of *M^r Zanchius Vrsine*, and others, we may thus briefly describe: *Sacrilege* is the taking away of things sacred .i. deputed to holie vses, or the maintenance of the worship of God. The matter about which this theft is conversant, are things consecrated to God; of which there are two sorts: some which God himselfe either by reservation, or expresse mandate, hath hallowed vnto himselfe; some which man hath hallowed and separated from common vse. of both read *Levit. 27. 28. 29. 30.* NOW that which makes vp the nature of sacrilege, is, the taking away or detainement of things thus hallowed, and returning them to common vse. Thus then I reason, the detainement or alienating of any thing separate from common vse, is sacrilege. But detainement or alienating of tithes, is the detainement and alienating of thinges thus separate. *Ergo*

To the proposition these answers I haue partly read, partly heard in conference. 1. Vnderstand it say some of things which haue beene consecrate by law. *Resp.* 1. no word of God forceth to such limitation. For even of

voluntary and votary consecrations both *Moses, Levit. 27.* and *Salomon, Prov. 20. 25.* speake. And was it not free to *Ananias* to consecrate or not, more then generall lawes of piety or charity might sway him, *Act. 5. 4.* whiles it remained was it not thine owne? And after it was sold was it *not in thy power*, said *Peter*? yet was *Ananias* his detainement sacrilege by 'circumstances of the text and consent of best interpreters. He is taxed by *Peter* not only for lying, but for theevish and clancular surreption of part of the price, *ver. 3.* and, saith *Beza* interpreting the word, *Ad sacrilegium etiam accessit diffidentia & hypocrisis.* See also *Centuriat. Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 4.* *Ambros. ser. 9.* *Dum ex eo quod promiserat, partem subtrahit, sacrilegiū simul condemnatur & fraudis. Sacrilegiū quod Deum in pollicitatione fefellerit: fraudis quod, &c: 2.* but grant it with that limitation; wee shall anone see, that with that limit we may assume of tithes that they haue bin consecrated.

A second restraint some haue thus given to the proposition; vnderstand it say they, of alienating things consecrated without error .i. to maintenance of true worship of the true God. Well, agreed; let it be so limited, though with faire probability and consent of no small clarks, we might contend the contrary. *Keckerman: prin-* *Syst. Polit. lib. 2. cap. 21.*
ceps iure non potest res sacras & bona cultui diuino etiam in genere destinata, etiam ea quæ superstitioso cultui seruiunt, in usum profanum transferre. But grant the limitation: can we not assume thus much of Tithes, that they haue bin consecrated to maintaine pure worship of the true God?

Thirdly vnderstand it say some, with these exceptions

ons. 1. Except in case of the churches superfluity; & this exception hath this ground; contentment with necessities is required of Ministers; for *Moses* cries *sufficit* at the building of the tabernacle: *Resp.* What word of god or sound reason giues liberty to alien seeming superfluities of Ministers rather then of other subiects? contentment with necessities being equally required of all, and *Moses* staies addition of more; returns or aliens nothing of what was brought by the people, no not though there were an overplus. But secondly grant the proposition with that exception; in what case, in what times may we not with that limit assume of tithes?

Their second exception is when alienation is necessary for preservation of the Church. *Resp.* An use of such goods for the time, may perhaps in that case bee allowed: perpetuall alienation, besides facts of some men, nothing makes probable. The shew bread was made common to *David* & his company in extremitie: but might it therefore be perpetually aliened, such necessitie ceasing?

Their last exception, when Princes haue no other meanes to remunerate subiects, faithfull in common services. *Resp.* What, I wonder, in such case laies open Church goods to the will of Princes, rather then the goods of common subiects? Thus I reason and leaue them: privat goods of subiects, Magistrats may not alien from them for recompense of servants, much lesse may the Lords portion bee transferred to such uses. See *Gen.* 47. 22.

Thus then the proposition is cleere as it was propounded: let vs grant it with these limits or so many of them

them as haue any shew of reason to support them, and thus conclude. The detainment or alienating of things by law consecrated to pure worship of the true God, without superfluity, anie longer then necessitie requires is sacrilege. But tithes haue been by law consecrated to maintenance of pure worship of the true God, are not superfluous, and now no such necessitie of their alienation. *Ergo* their detainment is sacrilege.

The fourth reason followes. Whatsoever duty prescribed in the word of God not either ceremoniall or Iudiciall, that is vndoubtedly of perpetuall observation. But payment of tithes is a duty prescribed in the worde of God, and is neither ceremoniall nor iudiciall. *Ergo* of perpetuall observation. The proposition I thinke none will doubt of, sith there is no duty prescribed in the word of God which fals not vnder some member of this distribution, and only Iudicials & ceremonies were temporary.

See we therefore whether our assumption for both parts of the predicate may bee avowed. And first that this is no dutie ceremonious; these reasons evince. 1. Ceremoniall ordinances were all shaddowes of things to come, the body whereof is Christ. This no shaddow of things to come, for where is the body which this shadowed some, who yet will haue it no ceremony but a iudiciall, frame this ceremonious resemblance. The number of ten is a number of perfection, and by paying in this number, as by a signe, the offerer makes protestation of his owne imperfection, & of his expecting perfection in Christ. Prettie too too, Others thus, they were paid in signe of thankfulness; others, *in signum vniuersalis*

salis Domini. Twentie such like; a tolerable wit would devise; but can they shew vs these significations or ends of payment in the Scripture, even but obscurely so much as by allusion intimated? I dare say no, nor any other end, no not of their payment to Leviis, but maintenance and recompense for their service.

2 All ceremonies haue an analogicall resemblance of the things they signified. Therefore called *† shadows of things to come*, because that as the shadowe carries though a darke, yet some resemblance of the body whose shadow it is; so ceremonies of Christ: therefore termed also *§ similitudes of heavenly things*, being ordained by their very semblances *to teach the rude*. This hath no Analogicall resemblance either of imperfection, or thankfulness, or Gods vniversal dominion. For who can, I say, not only avow his frame, but even frame *is* except absurdly? giue vs such an analogy of this as we are able to shew of others, wee will then beleue their payment, to haue beene leuitically ceremonious. Of sprinklings and purifyings, of Tabernacle, of Arke, of Propitiatory, of high Priest (and indeed of what not, that was truly a shadow of heavenly things?) we finde their analogie in the word of God. For instance, as

2 Heb. 9. 7. 2.

high Priest amongst the Iewes alone entered into the holy of holies not without blood: so Christ into heaven, &c. Can those that so confidently avow tithes to haue been ceremonies, thus drawe out the similitude betwixt the and heavenly things?

3 Whatsoever ordinance was before leuiticall lawe, *† Heb. 14. & 18* not foreshadowing Christ, that is no ceremonie. But *& Col. 2. Heb. 4. & c.* payment of tithes such. *† Ergo.* No leuiticall ceremony may

may be vsed after publishing of the Gospel. (The school men say well, *iudicialia post Christum be mortua*, because they bind not: *ceremonialia, mortifera*; their very reviving vnlawfull and deadly.) But payment of tithes, by consent of all, except Brownists, may be retained. Ergo.

5 J finde not that the Lord in propheticall scriptures taxeth so much the omisso of ceremonies, or exacteth in so strict rearmes their performance, as hee doth this of tithes ^k. Something J finde of their faultie performance; something, of their sticking in them with neglect of moralities: and this to me is a presumptio, they were other then ceremonies.

Lastly J never read Christ speak so much of any Jewish ceremonie, as he did of tithes; ^l *these things ought you to haue done*. Though J confesse, as much might haue beene said of ceremonies during those times. All these considered, may J not conclude of tithing, it was no ceremonie? See wee whether perhaps it were a iudiciall, concerning only the nation of the Iewes, and founded on equitie particular to that people. This is indeed the olde tenent of Papists. But I say some, Iudicials were all of duties from man to man. This ordinance of holy things to be done to God, Therefore not iudiciall.

But what, trow we, imagine Papists to bee the civill equitie of this ordinance, particularly concerning the nation of the Jewes? Forsooth saith *Bellarmino* out of *Thomas*, the tribe of *Leui* being but the tenth, or at most the twelfth or thirteenth part of the Jewes: tenths must be theirs that equitie may be kept, and that tribe haue no greater portion then the rest. *Resp.* 1. but it is wel answered that this end of their assignement to *Levi*, hath

Reclamare mundo, libera voce pronuncia ceremonias Iudeorum & pernitiosas esse, & mortificas christianis.

Hierom. epist. August. 11.

^k *Mal. 3. 9.*

^l *Mat. 23.*

no mention in Scripture: they are given to *Levi* for recompence of this service, as the Lords portion primarily, other end or reason of their assignation wee finde none. 2. If this were the end of their allotment to *Levi*: surely the Lord much forgot himselfe, that besides the tenthes of all mens goods, would allot them share in sacrifices and vowes, and 48 Citties with Suburbes of so large circuit as we read, *Numb. 35. 4. 7.*

3 Be it granted, that this was some reason of their assignement to *Levi*: how concludes this the ordinance in generall? For the injunction of tithing was as old as *Gen 14. 20.* *Abraham*¹, when was no place for partition of Gods people by tribes. And if this be all they haue to proue them iudicials, I shall craue pardon for subscribing to their iudgement. Lastly, yeeld them Iudicials: yet if of common equitie, if confirmed by positiue law, if consenting with law of nature, if serving to vphold morall duties; binds not the ordinance for ever? I conclude therefore, sith neither ceremoniall nor iudiciall, or if iudiciall, yet of commō equitie: therefore their payment is perpetually to be observed.

The last reason (for I had rather giue reasons by weight then number) is taken frō practise of the church in all times frō beginning of the world downe to these last daies of reformation: ever since God had a ministry in the world, tithes were their maintenance. Before the law, the first borne; then, the ordinary priests, received tithes. ² *Gen. 14. 20* For that, that *Melchisedec* was *Shē Noahs* eldest son, at least by priuiledge, if not by birth, few question, none disproue: for the time vnder the law, is no question. For Apostles times or much of them, the vse of tithes

tithes, persecutiō or scandale forced to be intermitted. Yet continued thar *Ius* ever in them, and their inferior Presbyters. And therefore they vrge yeelding of maintenance; such no doubt in their generall aime as was certaine by the word of God; such as had bin in vse: yea plead for portionⁿ of al goods; for double honour. After when God was pleased to graunt even but a little rest, & breathing time to the Churches, presently came tithes againe to be the Ministers portiō. *Cyprian* whose martyrdomē fel into the yeare of the Lord 259. according to *Ensebius* his computatiō, amongst other goods of the church, more then intimats tithes to haue bin cōmitted to Bishops as generall stewards by whom they were distributed to inferiour Ministers. Vpon occasion taxing *Geminus Victor* for appointing *Geminus Faustinus* a presbyter, overseer of his will, and thereby occasioning distraction from his ministry, sets down by way of aggravation the course established in the Church of God for preventing such distractions in the ministry. As by Gods owne authority and disposition, the tribe of *Leui* received tithes from the other tribes, &c. that they might by no meanes be called away, or cōstrained to thinke or deale with things secular: the same course and order is now holden in the Church, *Vt qui in Ecclesia Domini ordinatione clerici promoventur, in nullo ab administratione diuina auocentur, nec molestijs & negotijs secularibus alligentur, sed in honore sportalantium fratrum tanquam decimas ex fructibus accipientes, ab altari & sacrificijs non recedant, sed die ac nocte celestibus rebus & spiritualibus seruiant.* this mentions *Cyprian* as i a course in his time received in the Church. In the same age a few

Gal. 6. 6.

1. Tim. 5. 17.

Epist. 66.

Gent. 3. esp. 10.

Gratian caus.
13. q. 1.

yeares after was *Dionysius* bishop of Rome about the
 yeare 266. This man (as *Platina* in his life testifieth; and
 as himsele of himsele, in his epistle to *Severus*.) assigned
 severall Churches to severall Ministers, as parishes,
 least one Pastor might defraud another: the question
 being then, not whether to any, but vnto what church,
 tithes were to be paid. The conclusion extant at large
 in the body of the Canon law, with some reasons (both
 most cōsonant to his decree;) it will not be amisse briefly
 to collect; because it is of some vse in this matter of
 tithes. That which is proved there, is, that tithes are
 payable to the baptissmall Churches, and to the Mini-
 sters there serving God, and ministring to the people.
 After many testimonies heaped vp together, *Gal. 6. 6. 1.*
Cor. 9. at length it is concluded with this expostulation;
Quis plantat vineam, &c. who plants a vineyard, & eats
 not of the fruit thereof? *Nos plantavimus vineam, &c. os*
vultis edere? Item *præcepit Dominus per Moysen, ut nemo*
mittat falcem in alienam messem. Hec messis nostra est, &
vos vultis falcem in eam mittere? Item *Apostolus, they that*
serve at the altar line of the altar: sed numquid de eo cui nō
serviunt? Qui in sacrario operantur, cum sacrario partici-
pant: sed numquid cum illo in quo non operantur? &c.

That I may not spend time & paper whiles I doe but
 a flum agere: for the next age, read what *Hierome* hath
 touching practise of, the Church, in his epistle to *Ne-*
potian; *Ambrose* his iudgement in *scr. quadrages.*

In times succeeding, *Chrysost.* hom. 18. in *Act. August.*
 in *Psal. 146.* &c: calling for tithes, and sharply reprov-
 ing their detainment or spare payment. For Councils, that
 one Synode called *Antiochenensis* held anno 580; the se-

cond

Centuriæ.

cond holden at that citty, *Can. 5.* not only ordaines their payement, but sheweth the observation of that duety to haue bin of long standing in the Christian Church, *Leges diuine consulentes sacerdotibus ac ministris ecclesiarum pro hereditaria portione, omni populo praeceperunt, decimas fructuum suorum locis sacris praestare, ut nullo labore impediti, per res illegitimas, spiritualibus possint vacare ministerijs. Quas leges Christianorum congeries longis temporibus custodierit, intemeratas nunc autem paulatim praeuicinatores legum, paene Christiani omnes ostenduntur, dum ea quae diuinitus sancita sunt, adimplere negligunt. Vnde statuimus ac decernimus, ut mos antiquus à fidelibus reparetur, & decimas ecclesiasticis famulantibus ceremonijs populus omnis inferat.*

After this say the Century writers out of *Auentine*, *Cent. 8. c. 7. de lib. 3. Annal. decimas à profanis occupatas Carolomannus bonis Eccl. suo edicto restitui iubet. Tithes vsurped by seculars, or (as perhaps he names them for their fact) profane persons, Charlemaine by his edict commads to be restored. The same authors out of Crantzins his metropolis, lib. 1. cap. 8. talem statum Carolus magnus post inpositum iugum Christi reliquit in provincia, ut liber esset populus à tributorum iugo, & iterum Ecclesijs & pontificibus iure decimarum obnoxius permaneret.*

To leaue forrenners, in England *Anno Dom. 786.* after accompt of these writers, was holden a Synode of all states of the kingdomes, and the decrees thereof subscribed, by the seuerall kings then raigning, and their assessors, Bishops, Dukes, and Cominalltie. In the 17 chapter of which Council thus we read, *De Decimis dandis, sicut in lege scriptum est, decimam partem ex omnibus frugibus suis.* *Cent. 3. cap. 9.*

tuis seu primitiis deferas in domum domini dei tui: rursum per prophetam: adserte, inquit, omnem decimam in horreum meum, ut sit cibus in domo mea: et probate me super hoc, &c. dicit dominus: sicut sapiens ait, nemo iustam Eleemosynam de his que possidet facere valet, nisi prius separaverit domino, quod a primordio ipse sibi reddere delegavit: ac per hoc plerumq; contingit, ut qui decimam non tribuit, ad decimam revertatur. Vnde etiam cum obtestatione precipimus, ut omnes studeant, de omnibus que possident, decimas dare, quia speciale domini dei sui est: & de novem partibus sibi vivat, & Eleemosynas tribuat. More need not be added. now in after times the case of tithes stood amongst vs, practise of the Church in this land till the daies of Henry the 8, abundantly witnesseth: exorbitancie enough from the primary rule of assignement to parish Churches might be noted; but till those daies nothing is found of their whole alienation to seculars.

As a corollary here let vs oblerue that tithes of Eng land haue bin by law separate from common vse: the inferencethence is out of former grounds, that they could never be lawfully alienated. Yes said one once; for eius est tollere, cuius ponere. Resp. Peter was not acquainted with any such mixime in the case of Ananias; and Levit. 27. Thing; once separated from common vse, are forever holy unto the Lord. and heare Keckerman, *Princeps iure non potest &c.* Things sacred or goods designed, or destined to divine worship, though but in a generality, yea though they serue to superstitious worship, Princes haue no right to transfer to common vse. If his sentence swaie nothing, heare his reason: *Res sacra pertinent ad statum & scopum reipub. eminentiorem & perfectiorem, ideo ad inferiorem retrahi*

retrahi non debent. media enim perfectiorem finem respicientia, non debent abusive ad imperfectiorem applicari. And Polanus, *Res sanctas* è quarum numero est possessio Deo sanctificata, neq. vendat, neq. permutet, neque transferat ququam. Ratio legi addita est; quia res sancta non sunt hominum, sed ipsius Iehova, cui dicata, cui consecrata, cui sanctificata sunt &c. Ambrose when one thus presseth him to deliver vp the Temple to the Emperour; because all things were his: thus answers; *Nolite gravare Imperator, ut putes te in ea quæ divina sunt imperiale aliquid in habere; noli te extollere: sed si vis diutius imperare, esto Deo subditus: scriptum est: quæ Dei Deo, quæ Caesaris Cesari.* But enough of this. we have seen the practise of the church in all times, and so their iudgement for this duty of tithing; which alone, so long, so generally, on such grounds continued, me thinks proves more for their paiment, then any prescription though never so gray headed, or even bald with age, can for their detainment.

In Ezech. c. 48.
vers. 14.

Epist. 33.

I might ad to this continual practise of the Church; the vnanimous consent of divines in iudgement, from Apostles daies downeward; till such time as Popish Demi-sacrilege had made seisure of tithes, transferring them from parochial Pastors to the Covets of Drones: then began their Schoolemen to studie shifts, whereby to iustifie the practise of their Synagogue, and after many disputes, resolved of this as best plaster for that sore, that forsooth they were Judicials. I might also adioine the consenting practise of heathen by light of nature, yea suffrages of sundry late divines; but that this taske is sufficiently done by others; and authorities of men even best learned and devoutest, beare little sway

in truthes so dangerous. This only I desire, that in this question we may contend with reasons, rather then authorities: not that I feare to bee overlaid either with waight or number of voices; for the ods in both kindes I dare avow to be with vs. But 1. whereto tends committing of divines in fight, except to worke distraction in people? And, 2. the saying of *Augustine* is me thinkes iudicious; *Scripturarum autoritatibus, non quorumque proprijs, sed utriusque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet.* And of the proving part hetherto.

Let vs now proceed to examine such arguments as are brought by the adverse part to disprove this truth; such I meane as seeme to haue any footing in the word of God. For other, others haue fully and often answered them. Thus then some reason. Tithes are not in all the new Testament specified to bee the ministers maintenance; so indeed reasons *Bellarmino*, so *Thomas*, so *Canisius* and many others of that rancke of honest men. *In nova lege*, in the new law *i.* in scriptures of the newe Testament we finde no such precept, *Ergo* not due to Ministers by the word of God. *Resp.* Now sure I had thought it had bene sufficient to haue found them grounded on any part of Scripture not particularly concerning the Church of the Iewes, because ^o the whole Scripture is given by inspiration from God; and ^o that word of Prophets (saith Peter) is a most sure word, we shall doe well to attend thereto. And therefore hetherto it hath been a maxime amongst divines; *A parte scriptura non valet argumentum negativè.* Its a morall statute given to Magistrates to punish with death, ^o the shedder of mans blood; yes

• 1. Tim 3. 16.
P. 1. Pet. 1. 19.

1 Gen 9. 6.

yet J finde it not specified in all the new Testament: an ordinance irrevocable that the Sabbath bee kept with cessation from labours; yet specification of the durie J finde not in the new Testament. Sundry the like might be instanced, as by view of that place *Ezek. 32 7. ad 12.* to every man may appeare. Only let mee intreat men fearing God, not so farre to forget their reverence to the old scriptures, and the spirit that inspired them, as to deny the their share with the new Testamēt in this honour; of being rule in part of their faith and practise. This age is strangely in loue with Epitomees. if faith it selfe shall be drawne to her compendium; But let vs beware we fall not into Manicheisme. Christ said of *Moses* ^{Aug. de bono perfic. lib. 2. cap. 11.} *He should iudge the Jewes*, so shall hee and Prophets iudge Christians also, as well as Evangelists and Apostles.

2 Who can question this truth so cleare to all men? so necessary for all that will with *Tertullian* maintaine the fulnesse of the Scriptures? That *scripture teacheth as well what it implies, as what it expresseth.* Teacheth it not particulars in generals? Effects or consequents in principles? equals by equivalence? The conclusion is not expressed in scriptures of the new Testament; that precept of Sabbath is not abrogated; yet taught in the new Testament. Sith no precept of the Decalogue abrogated; ^{Mat. 5. 17.} *Ergo* not that of Sabbath. The conclusion not expressed in the new Testament; *Infants are to bee baptised*, yet taught in the new Testament: ^{Act. 2. 38. 39} *sith to whome promises, kingdome, covenant, spirit belong, to them baptisme.* ^{Mar. 10. 14.} *Ergo* to infants. These doctrines are all taught in the new ^{1. Cor. 7. 14.} Testament, because generals, principles, or equivalents ^{Act 10. 47.}

are there taught. And so haue wee tithes prescribed in the new Testament, *vt supra*. Yea more the so *implicite*; as in former reasons hath already appeared. Its by this occasion nowe in my minde that *Tertullian* hath in his treatie *de spectaculis*; where bēding himselfe to disswade Christians from presence at such prophane and barbarous spectacles as were then in vse, hee thus shapeth answer to a reason of this mould: *Quorundam fides* (faith he) *aut simplicior, aut scrupulosior, ab hac abdicatione spectaculorum de scripturis autoritatem exposcit, & se in incertum constituit, quod non significanter neg, nominatim denuncietur* (seruis Dei abstinentia eiusmodi: Some mens faith (saith *Tertullian*) whether over simple, or over scrupulous, demaundes our authoritie from scriptures for this abandoning such sights; and makes it selfe doubtful because such abstinence is not there expressely and by name inioined to the servants of God. Whereto he answers; *pland nusquam inuenimus, &c.* Its true, saith that autor, we finde not in any place, that as it is apertly said, *thou shalt not kill, &c.* so its expressely defined, *thou shalt not goe to the circle or Theater &c.* but wee finde that general of *David* to touch this particular; Blessed is hee that hath not walked in the counsell of the vngodly, nor stand in the way of sinners; if in no way of sinners, then not in this: *Nam apud spectacula & in via statur, &c.* There needs no application.

Now this argument the same for substance some haue vrged with this *Text*; In scriptures of the newe Testament, where Ministers maintenance is purposely treated of, no mention is to be found of tithes; and that is at least a presumption, their payment is no perpetual ordinance

ordinance of God. For is it likely the particular would haue beene concealed? *Resp.* Perhaps, and but perhaps not; 1. If either state of the times had borne it, or 2. necessitie required, or 3. Apostles had beene willing to vrge the vttermost of right. But considering first the distresse of the times, was such, as scarce any could call any thing his owne; 2. weighing againe how fully the particular was in the old Testament determined; lastly pondering how loth the Apostles were, to exact right, least any occasion should be given, to suspect of mercenary or covetous affection in preaching; it was as convenient to omit particularizing the quantitie, as to remit the vse of all right, as to some Churches some pra-ctised.

2 But yet this I finde; they call for a double honour. For maintenance due by law of nature, and nations, and by ordinance of Christ, and that is either tithes, or else no certaine particular. u 1. Tim. 5. 17.
* 1. Cor. 9. 5.
ad 14.

3 Who will vndertake to evidence the particulars of all duties of iustice, charity, temperance, even there where hee shall finde such duties purposely prescribed? Or be so bold (*ne quid drom grauius*) as to exclude particularities of these duties from mention of Gods spirit because the generals are only handled, vpon supposed likelihoods, or presumptions truly presumptuous? Leauē we therefore this argument, and see whither the rest haue better colour. *Bellarmino* endeavouring to dis-
proue the morality of this duty, thus reasons; Moral duties haue ever bound conscience, eue before the law of *Moses*. But the lawe of tithes was not till the times of *Moses*. *Ergo. Resp.* the proposition we acknowledge. The

minor how will he proue? If hee shall reason from the scriptures silence; the same may be said of adultery, Idolatry, periury, almost of what not? 2. We haue that which is equivalent to a precept; the approved practise of the Saints of God; yea if *Lysa* may be credited, an implied precept given to *Jacob*, *Gen. 35.1.* when he is commanded to build an altar at *Bethel* according to his vow made, *Gen. 28.* Looke backe to what is said in clearing the first Argument, and thereby iudge whether the precept of tithing were in those daies given, or not.

His next reason is this, Reason naturall teacheth not the payment of tenthes to Priests, but only of what is sufficient to their sustentatiō. *Ergo* not morall. *Resp.* neither doth reason direct to keeping a seaventh daie, but only a separation of some solemne times to Gods worship. But who would consult with reason corrupted, & blinde since the fall, to determine of moralities? Since al it reacheth vnto, even where it hath some helpe frō generall grace, are generalities only of morall duties?

His last reason, Matters of vow are no moralities: *7 Gen. 28. 22.* tithes were *7* vowed by *Jacob*: *Ergo* not commaunded. *Resp.* And are all matters of vow things arbitrary, none moralities? What thinke yee of that *ver. 21.* uttered in some vow, and as it were with the same breath of *Jacob*; *If the Lord will go with me, and keepe mee in the way that I shall goe, &c. then shall the Lord be my God?* Was it a matter Arbitrary to *Jacob* to haue the Lord, and him only to be his God? being the substance of the first morall precept: Yet was it vowed by *Jacob*, as we see, on like conditiō with tithes. More instances might be alleaged: but *quorū sum?*

Proceed wee to argumentes of our owne divines.
 Tithes say some are originally in kings and civill Magi-
 strates, and its their Mishpat. i. *ius* to dispose of
 them to civill or religious vse. For saith the Lord;
 of Israels king, *Hoc erit ius regis vestri*, &c. hee shall
 take tithes, *1. Sam. 8. 15. Resp.* Is it possible men shoulde
 advisedly thus reason out of this scripture? The Lorde ^{Levit. 27. 30}
 had long ere this declared tithes to be his, ^{Num. 18. 24.} assigned the
 to *Levi* for his service in the tabernacle: and that ynder
 Magistrats civill though not kings. When in his wrath
 he giues a king to Israel, revoked he his ordinance of ti-
 thing to *Levi*? Who can think it? I stand not to dispute
 the question, whether the words describe a king, or ra-
 ther a tyrant. But this I am sure is evident: the Lorde
 there shewes the many mischiefs shoulde befall them
 as a plague for their rejecting the government by him-
 selfe established, such as shoulde make them cry ynder
 the burthen of his exaction. A course becoming an ex-
 orbitant tyrant, rather then a regular king. *Yea*: yea but
 this shalbe his Mishpat, his *ius* ver. 12. *Resp.* And why
 his *ius* rather then his guise? His right rather then his
 fashion? As most tender, and the word oft signifies. See
1. Sam. 27. 11. was it his *ius* to take from the people their
 fields and vineyards, and best olive yards to giue to his
 servants? As is said, *2. Sam. 12. 10.* How then sinned *Abiathar* in
 coveting the vineyard of *Naboth*? And desiring to pur-
 chase it with money? Yea, why offers he money or deales
 by way of contract? It was his *ius* being a king, to take
 vineyards & fields from subjects to giue to his servants:
 much more to keepe for his owne benefit and conveni-
 ency. 3. Alienation of possessions from tribes and fami-
 lies.

lies was flatly forbidden to the Jewish people, that Christs lineage and descent might bee kept vnconfounded.

2. But what when it is yeelded hee had a *sur* to exact tithes of subjects? Must it needs be vnderstood of tithes of Levits assigned them of God? and not rather of other tithes which he might craue in *subsidiu*? as *c* fifts were once imposed vpon Egyptians. Certainly *Ezechias* it seemes, thought tithes the Levits due, and therefore amongst other precepts of reformation, requires their payment to Levi, as thinking tithes committed to him (if at all to him) but as Church goods of old were vnto Bishops, *non ut dominis*, but *ut economis*. And the people bring the to Levites in the name of holy things that were consecrated vnto God.

Apostles received not tithes in their daies. *Ergo, Resp.* That is hard, that I say not, impossible to proue. 2. not tithes, no nor ought els of some churches; but made their owne hands minister to their necessities, that they might not be scandalous to weake brethren, nor chargeable to afflicted churches; 3. yea suffered bonds, reproches, yea death; &c. must therefore the Churches of all ages receive like measure from her children? 4. The question is *de iure non de facto*: & that *ius* was remitted, because burthen some to those times; as circumcision was in the wilderness, *Iosue* 5. 5.

If tithes be thus due to Ministers, why not also first fruits, for these also were commanded to be paid to Levites? *Resp.* To these and all arguments following, this generall answer may serue; that wee claime not tithes by vertue of the precept given for Levites. Who ever
heard

heard vs thus reason? God commanded tithes to be paid to Levites: *Ergo* tithes are due to the Ministers of the Gospell. But thus we claime them; as due to God by reservation from the beginning, as following Christs priesthood, as the only certainty mentioned in scripture, as consecrated to God by consent of Churches & Edicts of princes, as agreeing with the vse and practise of the Church in all times. For the mandate of God concerning Levi, we make it not the ground of our title to tithes. So that of these reasons we may say as he, they are *Nihil ad Rhombum*. Yet that nothing be wanting to any mans satisfaction, I answer, 1. that first fruits were paid to Aaron,^d as to high priest, whose priesthood is ^{d Heb. 7. 11. 12.} now passed to another; 2. vpon a reason particular to that people; 3. for sacrifice, as appeares at large, *De. 26. 2. ad 11.* appeares there any such thing of Tithes? Lastly they were figures as should seeme, of Christ,^e *The first* ^{e 1 Cor 15. 20.} *fruits of them that sleepe*; of beginnings of sanctification, called by the Apostle *f the first fruits of the spirit.* ^{f Rom. 8. 23.} Can any of these be avouched of tithes? Who the sees not manifest disparity betweene the two?

If this be a duty of people to pay tithes to Ministers: the that also of Ministers to *pay tithes to the high Priest.* ^{Num. 18. 28.} *Resp.* The argument proceedes from a false *Hypothesis*, supposing vs to claime tithes by mandate Leviticall. Which we vterly disclaime, *ut supra. 2.* But yet farther I answer; It followes not if one, then the other due. 1. For ^h *that our high Priest needs them not*: but only hath ^{h Ps 110. 13.} ^{i 1 Cor 9. 14.} ordained for them that ⁱ preach the gospel. 2. Sacrifices are now ceased, to which these *Decima secundanae* chiefly served ^k; so that their reason is no more but this, If ^{k Num. 18. 28. 29. 30.}

tithes for stipend, then tithes for sacrifice: he is meere-ly *ἀλογιστής*, that discernes not the inconsequence.

¹Mal 3 10.

If precept of tithing be moral, the that also of ¹bring-
ing them to *one common storehouse*. Resp. This argumēt
also proceedeth from like fained *Hypothesis*. See *supra*.
& yet hath no good cōsequence: for must the substance
of a duty needs be Levitical, because some circūstances
thereof concern only Iewish nation? The must Sabbath
also evē for substance be ceremoniall, because some cir-
cumstances & ends belong only to Iews *Deut. 5. 15*.

^mNum. 18. 24

If precept of tithes be moral, then that also of Mini-
sters not ^mhaving portio amongst their brethrē. Resp. The
same fallacy that before; for we claime not by precept
given to *Levi*. And yet the argument follows not. 1. for
faith *Polanus* (though I avow not his answer) that or-
dinance was figuratiue; foreshadowing Christ that
had not where to lay his head. But 2 it was never forbid-
den Levits to haue portion amongst their brethren in
that sense that these men take portion. They ⁿHad cit-
ties with their suburbs which were their perpetuall posses-
sion, and passed from father to sonne; subiect to same
lawes of Redemption as others. Wherefore *Jeremie* a
Pricstes sonne ^obuies the fiede of his vnckle as next of
kin. See also *1. King. 2. 26*. Thus therfore vnderstād that
ordinance of Levits having no portion amongst their
brethren. No portion, that is, no such portion, separate
frō their brethren, as had other tribes, not simply none:
the Reason thereof was *Iacobs* prophecy ^ptouching
their scattering amongst their brethren. Disposed of also
by Gods providence for greater conveniency of the
peoples instruction, as also by situation of their citties
in ^qevery tribe is me thinks probable. Lastly a manifest

Polan in E
zech. 44. v. 18.

ⁿNumb. 35.
Levit. 25. 34.

^oIer. 32. 7. 9.

^pGen. 49. 7.

^qIosh. 21.

dis.

disparity there is between the two. For the childrē of Levits succeeded their parēts, & were for ever to be maintained by Levits portiō. Not so the childrē of Ministers, except they be ^r approved, & found meet for the ministry. ^{r 1. Tim. 3. Titus. 1.}

Lastly they obiect the place, *Numb. 18. 24.* vnanswerable, as they thinke, and such as if a man but turne to with a wet finger, he shall presently see tithing a ceremonious ordinance. Now for my part I haue viewed the place, and with my best attention considered what may thence be deduced to proue it ceremoniall. Yet finde not that it concludes either the ordinance in generall, or yet that Leviticall constitution to haue beene ceremonious, for thus wee must frame the Argument. If tithes were assigned to *Levi* for his service in the tabernacle: then is the ordinance of tithing meereley ceremonious; for that service was ceremoniall. But tithes were assigned to *Levi* for his service in the tabernacle. *Ergo. Resp. 1.* To say nothing that that particular assignement concludes not the ordinance at large, but the ordinance for *Levi* only: I answer 2. that by as good inference they may proue reverence, obedience, defence of Ministers, ceremonious duties, inasmuch as even these also belonged to Levites for their service in the tabernacle. For why must Israelits giue Levites honour, obedience, singular loue, &c: but for their worke sake? And what was their worke? But their service in the tabernacle. So that now our people owe vs no more honour, obedience, loue, &c. ^{r 1. Thes. 5. 12. 13. Heb. 13. 17.} for our worke sake, as it is prescribed. For these all belonged to Levites for their service in the tabernacle, which was ceremonious. Briefly; they were given to Levites for their service in

the tabernacle, *non quâ tabernaculi*; but *quâ service*. And therefore before tabernacle erected, they were paid to Priests, *Gen. 14. 3.* Was the whole service of the tabernacle ceremonious? Nay were not some maine parts of it, apparently morall? What thinke we of teaching the people? ^{11. Chr. 17. 9.} of *Reading the scriptures*, and *giving sense* ^{Act 15. 21.} *of praising God*? Were not these parts of tabernacle service? And had not the Levites maintenaunce for these, as well as for slaying sacrifices? Surely if this be the best and clearest reasons against tithing, I must needes professe, they are so farre from making me doubt of my conclusion, that they rather stablish my iudgment therein. And these are all the arguments I have yet heard urged by men of any iudgement, against the necessitie of paying tithes.

One other only which seculars vse, I will annexe; & that is drawne from a perilous inconvenience ensuing vpon this doctrine. What is it? Forsooth if tithes belöge to Ministers & are payable to them only, according to the word of God: it wil come to passe, that a Ministers portion shall exceed the allowance of two or three of his wealthiest parishioners. But that, I tell you, is a shrewd inconvenience. *Resp.* A mischief which I wonder the Lord in his endlesse wisdom never bethought him'selfe to prevent amongst the Israelites. The Levites, though according to the generall division of Israel by tribes, they were but a twelfth or thirteenth part: yet according to exact number of persons reckoned by polles, were scarce the sixtith part of the people. The number of the people without the Levites, amounted to ¹¹ sixe hundred and three thousands, siue hundred & fiftie

* Num. 1. 46.

fifty; to which if we adde their old men, and al from vnder twenty yeares amongst them which came not into the first number, ²allowing but double so many for the, they arise to about a thousand thousands and three hundred thousands. Now the Levites numbred from the infant to the old man, were found but two and twenty thousands only, ⁷ and that is not aboue the sixtith part of the people. Yet see, the Lord allots them the tenth of all the increate of the land: besides share in oblations, ² things consecrate by vow, and 48. citties with suburbs of so large circuit, that according to *Hieromes* measure of the land, exceeded the portion of any other tribe in Israell. Its marvell none woulde vnder take to be the Lords Counsellour, and to tel him such large allowance might make Levites prowde and lazy. But this large portion to the Lord seemed no inconvenience: howe seemes it so to vs, in Ministers of the Gospell? ^{* Numb. 1. 3.} ^{* Num. 3. 39.} ^{* Num. 35. 4. 7.}

Againe, how fals it; that to other orders & ranks of men, as lawyers, gentles, &c. their portions exceeding by more then fourths the portions of others, are not maligned; the Ministers of all other should bee subiect to envie?

Lastly, how is it, that men in their own, though far larger portion, know no measure, but adde continually thousands to hundreds; and (as *Agars* horseleach) crie, giue, giue; and as the graue, knowe no measure of desiring: yet of a ministers stipend, of fiftie, or an hundred pounds, cry *Sufficit*; Its enough, and too much? What, I wonder, is that great service these men performe, so over acceptable to God, or profitable vnto men, aboue the worke of a minister? that they should thinke them-

selues worthy of all, whatsoever by *a vijs & modis* they can scrape together; and yet to ministers, for their work sake, hardly betee me double honour in proportion to the meane wealthy amongst their people. *Tempora, Tēpora*, how are yee turned? But I conclude. Sith Tithes be long to Christs priesthoode, sith no other certainty allotted to Ministers in scriptures, sith detainment is sacrilege, sith tithing no ceremony nor particularly Iudiciall, sith confirmed by consent and practise of the Church in all times, lastly (which is not the least) sith reasons against it are of so no force, as wee haue seene: therefore tithes are the portion due to Ministers for their service in the Gospell.

Conclusion.

What now remaines? but to admonish such as feare God, to deliver their soules from the guilt of so fowle a sinne as is this of sacrilege. Why hang yee vp theeves that steale from men, oft times but as *Salomon* saith ^a *to satisfie their owne soules*; and liue your selues in open ^b *robbery of God* himselfe? Far be it from mee to multiply sins or to cast vnnecessary scruples into the consciences of Gods people. But faine I would knowe for my learning, of such as are so loth in this point to wound consciences (alas, how senselesse, and fleshed in sacrilege!) where God hath ever legitimated sacrilege; or made it lawfull vnder the new Testament, to alienate from him things consecrated to his worship: when turned the truth of that sentence into a lie; ^c *It is a sinne to deuoure holy things, and after the vow to enquire*. Nay the Lord it seemes, hath written it in the hearts of Naturalists with the point of a Diamond: howsoever some mens simple or wilful ignorāce, or impious profanenes, or insatiable covet.

^a Prov. 6. 30.

^b Mal. 3. 8.

^a Prov. 30. 25

Rom. 2.

Act. 3. 1. 3.

covetousnes seemes to detain this point of truth, as many other, in *unrighteousnes*. Whē Nabuchadnezzar had surprised the temple, & seized the sacred vessels appointed to Gods worship: in the midst of sacriledge, he feares to be sacrilegious; and therefore ^c brings them to the house of his Gods, supposed by him to bee the only true Gods. ^d Rom. 1. 18. Infinite I might be in propounding the sentences, and censures, that heathen passed vpon this point of impietie. And is there any man can doubt whither detainement of tithes be sacriledge, or not? Shape to they selfe a description of sacriledge with any sound limits determining its nature, and see whither vnder it fals not the detainement of tithes. I beseech you therefore suffer the words of exhortation: Give Caesar, Caesars; and God, that which is Gods. Neede I, I thinke, to presse it by reasons? Not sure if the belly had eares. But sweete sinnes, are the dangerous sinnes, because for the most part incorrigible; begetting in most, either a loathnesse to bee informed, or obfirmation against all perswasions. Yet let vs attempt; who knows whither the Lord may be pleased ^e to open the heart, if but of one Lydia, to attend to the things which are spoken? Consider therefore, I beseech you, even in the bowels of Christ Iesus; first the hairynousnesse of this sinne of sacriledge. They erre in ^f Zach. de vi-
chies iudgement, that make sacriledge only a branch of ^g ius exter. Cult.
theft, and breach of the eighth precept; yea rather it is a ^h opposit. Theß 3.
species of irreligion. Heare his reasons. For whence proceedes it; but from contempt of holy things, & manifest vnreverence towards God himselfe? wherefore steales any man things separate to preserve the ministrie, but because he contemnes the whole Ministry, yea God.

God himselfe to whose worshippe they are consecrated?

And wherevnto tendes such fraudulent, or violent praying vpon holy things: but to the viter overthrow of all religion? Sathan knowes well, Gods outwarde worship cannot be continued without the Ministerie, nor the Ministry without Ministers, nor Ministers without Church goods: and therefore provokes hee *Tyrants and profane men*, to invade the Churches possessions, that by that meanes he may hinder, if not wholly overthrowe, the state of religion. To this purpose *Zanchius*. Shall I adde one other reason? The rather because I see men thinke of this theft, even those that thinke worst, but as of thefts from men; they rob not God, but Ministers (if any) while they detaine tithes, or other things hallowed. Now let them consider, that the dominion, and propertie of all things hallowed, is Gods, and such consecration giues him seizure of them in fee; the vse only is the Ministers. *^b Quæ sanctificata sunt Domino, non sunt eorum, quibus data sunt, sed eius, cuius nomine possidentur.* Things hallowed to God, are not so much theirs, to whom they are given, as Gods in whose title they are possessed. Therefore (saith the Lord to the Israelites detaining tithes from the Levites) *Yee haue robbed not Levi, whose they are in vse, but me, in whom is the property and dominion.* Need any more reasons, then the enormity of the sinne? Heare then the detestation wherein in al times amongst all men, christians, or heathen, this sin was holden. To omit the bitter inuectiues every where obvious, consider the punishments appointed for the sacrilegious. *^b Charles the*

*^a Polan, in E.
2. ch. 48. 14.*

¹ Ma'. 3.

^b Gen. 9. cap. 7.

great

great in his time made this decree; that whosoever should invade, or waste, or by any cunning meanes presume to alienate the goods of the church, he should legally be punished by the Iudges, as an homicide, or sacrilegious theefe, excommunicated by the Bishops, deprived of burial, yea, as if his almes were infectious, or accursed, none must receiue it. Amongst the heathen ^{Laflant. de orig. Error. c. 3.} no tortures were thought sufficient for this sin, ^{m Plutarck de his qui sero a numine puniuntur.} scourging, burnings, rackings, hangings, any thing whatsoever their furie could devise to inflict. ^m At Delphes they vsed to cast them headlong from a rocke, which they called *Hympeia*. The *Aethiopians* had an herb they called *Ophiusa*, as of vnpleasing aspect, so of farre more dangerous effect taken into the body. It so affrighted with phantasmes of dreadfull serpents, that such as drak it made away themselves. ^{n Plin. hist. nat. lib. 26. cap. 17.} *Ob id* (saith *Pliny*) *cogebantur sacrilegi illam bibere*; for that cause were church robbers forced to drinke it.

Amongst our selues, breaking vp of churches, & stealing the least trifle, aggravates the theft, & makes the offender culpable of death. If the Philosopher were now aliue, would he not laugh at the spectacle? To see the great theues lead the smaller to the gallows? How is it a sin more hainous, to violate a temple, then to alienate Church maintenance from the worship of God? 3. If none of these moue, oh yet let the blood of so manie soules perishing by this, if not as a cause, yet as a greate occasiō, waken vs. Many motions I haue heard of, made for a learned ministry, that every congregation might haue ^{o Ier. 3. 15.} a past or to feed them with knowledge and understanding. For my part I say as *P Paule* in another case; *utina* ^{Gal. 5. 14.}

¶ Perkins in
Job. 33. 23.

excitantur 3. I would they were cut off that hinder it. But amongst all, how is it that the point of maintenance comes not to be consulted? It were to be wished that the Apostolique zeale burnt now in Ministers, that rather then soules should starue, they would freely giue what they haue freely receaved. But hee was ¶ an holie man that said, men are men, and must be allured by such arguments as may prevaile even with flesh and blood. It was Gods great wisdom in the creation, first to provide food, before he made the *Animal creatures*. And it's a shame to the Church in the daies of peace, to see men of best gifts therefore divert their studies to other arts, because the ministry affords not maintenance; for our Church most, where Gods allowance is so liberall, were it not that sacrilege did intercept it.

4 May J not adde the mischiefes temporall it hath brought vpon the land? Complaints are frequent amongst our people against inclosures: the decayers (they say) of husbandry, by which, saith Salomon, even kings are maintained. I dare say, that *peculatus*, if J may so tearme it, hath not beene more hurtfull this way, then hath this sacrilege. Cornefields were wont to laugh in our Gentlemens now pastures; but tithes seeme more compendious to the ground of housekeeping, then the toilesome tediousnesse of tilling the earth. And *scarfe a great man* now adaies, though but niggardly hospittall, that can keep open dores without a Parsonage. It were wel me thinkes amongst so many delicates, they would once in their liues eate one morcel of their own bread. Lastly, if these perswade not, yet let that terr our of the Lord prevaile with vs; *Its a curse* (saith Salomon) *to de-*

voure

voure holy things, a cursed practise, that brings downe Gods vengeance vpon the sacrilegious.

Examples we haue seene many, and read of more: euen kings themselues haue not gone vppunished. The *flying booke of Gods vengeance*, Enter (saith Zecherie) ^{Zeck. 5. 4.} into the house of the theefe, and consumes it with the timber, and the stones thereof leaues scarce a monument where hee hath bene. Is God thus sharpe against petite thefts, and will he leaue sacrilege vnavenged? Search records diuine, humane: where findest thou a rob-God without his vengeance? obserue these sacrilegious amongst our selues: its much if they prosper to the fourth generatiō; much, (though God be much in sparing) if hee either leaue not them childlesse, or their children gracelesse, by one meanes or other makes them not vomit those morsels of holy things, that they haue deuoured. riches with lay men, are as the ^{1. Sam. 5. 6,} Arke with the Philistims, plaguing the vniust possessors, til they retorne to the right ^{9. 11.} owners.

Enough I hope of this first sinne. And too much per haps some wil say, too ful of eartnes. Let them remember the *Callum* is thicke, and needs a hot *Cauterie*. Yea but it may wound the conscience; *Vtinam*. The remedy is at hand, *Restitnatur ablatum, vt dimittatur peccatum*. now soeuer, for my soule, I dare not ^{Isai 5. 20.} speake good of euill, Read *Ezech. 13. 22.*

2 As to our people, wittie, alas, to their own harme, in shifing to detain that little of the Lords portion still left him. I say as ** Hezechias* (I would, I could hope ^{2. Par. 31. 4.} with like successe) Gine the portion to Priests, and Levits, to Ministers of the Gospell, that they may bee en-

couraged in the law of the Lord. Needes any more reasons then the encouragement of your Ministers. Heare *Malachy*; Detainment is robbery in the highest degree; sacrilege; *ye have robbed mee*, saith the Lord to with-holders. 2. Robberie detested by Idolaters; *will a man, will an Idolater spoile his Gods?* For shame let not Christians spoile their God. 3. *T. these are Gods* by reservation from the beginning, Ministers are but his receavers. 4. Payment *sets open the windows of heaven* and brings downe a blessing in abundance; 5. Detainement, a curse, yea upon whole kingdomes. That saying of Salomon, let never bee forgotten; *Honour God with thy substance and with the increase of all thine increase* so shall thy barnes be filled with abundance; is a blessing annexed to this dutie. Will any say its spoken only for that state of the Church in Israel? Let him peruse the whole booke, and instance but in one precept there given of Leviticall performances, except he will too absurdly *insure in propositio*.

More perswasions I wil not adde: how feare I, that I shall not perswade, no nor though I doe perswade? Shall I presume to speake of the figleaves men have sowne to themselves to hide their shame? Some thus: To honest able Ministers they thinke them due; but dishonest &c. makes vncapable. *Resp.* With what conscience then detain yee from such whole honesty and abilitie your selves will testifie? 2. The Levites in *Malachie* his daies *had broken the covenant, were become ignorant, partiall, contemptible*; yet even in those times called the Lord for tithes. 3. What law of God, or man, permits to private men detainment of dues even from the dishonest. *b* To wicked Magistrats tribute must be paid. 4. Tithes are due

due to Ministers, not *quâ probi*; but *quâ ministri*: not for their honesty; but for their Ministerie.

As to those other obiections, of customes, prescriptions, exemptions &c. I say no more, but what the Apostle in this case; *God is not mocked*. A pretty mocke-God answer it will bee, at that great day when thou shalt stand before the great *Proprietarie* to bee examined, how faithfully thou hast given Tithes according to his assignement; to tell him: for matter of tithing, thou hadst a custome to the contrary. Dally not with conscience, deceaue not thy selfe, god sure wil not thus be deluded.

*Ve tibi flumen
moris humani
quandiu non
siccabitur Aug.
confess.
Gal. 6. 7.*

Thus far of this question at your request; to whome vnderferved kindnesse hath engaged mee so farre. as my weake abilities can extend themselus. Of this tract thus thinke; The Authior thinketh himselfe a man, & therefore subiect to errour. Yet would faine so carry himself, as to deserue of Gods Church the esteeme of an honest man, and therefore no lover of errors; much lesse a Patrone of them against his knowledge and conscience.

FINIS.

C 21841

69247

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION